(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

ವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ 'ವಿಲೀನ ವಿರೋಧ ಸಮಿತಿ' ಏನಾಯಿತು ಎಂದರೆ 'ವಿರೋಧ' ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಯಿತು. 'ಮೈಸೂರು ವಿಲೀನ ಸಮಿತಿ' ಆಯಿತು. ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ, ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ಕೇರಳ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸೇರಲಿ, ಆಂಧ್ರಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸೇರಲಿ, ತಮಿಳು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಸೇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ "ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾ ವಿಲೀನ ಸಮಿತಿ" ಆಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ವಿಲೀನಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾವು ವಿಲೀನ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅದು ಸರಿ. ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರ ವಿಲೀನ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂಬ ಗೋಜಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು. ವಿಲೀನದ ಸಾಧ್ಯಾಸಾಧ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಲೀನ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಬಹುಮತದ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿತೋ ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಮತ್ತೊ ವಿಲೀನವಾದರೆ ಮತ್ತೊ ಸಂತೋಷ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಜೋನಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈಗ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಈ ದಿವಸ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೋ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the States Reorganisation Bill, 1956, referred by the President under Article 3 of the Constitution be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next item.

SPECIAL RESOLUTION ON STATES REORGANISATION.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ (ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಇಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

"ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲರುವ ಈಗಿನ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ, ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳು ಶೀಘ್ರವಾಗಿ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೂ ಮತ್ತು ಭಾರತದ ಐಕ್ಯತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಭದ್ರತೆಯನ್ನು ದೃಢಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೂ, ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವಾಗ ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆಗಾಗ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಭಾಷಾವಾರು ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರಾದೇಶಿಕ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ದ್ವಿಭಾಷಾ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ."

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I rise to a point of order. I submit that this Special Resolution is not admissible. In the first place, we are in the midst of the discussion of the S. R. Bill which was referred to us by the President of India for our opinion. We have not yet finished that work. We have still to consider a number of amendments and they are very important. If this Special Resolution is to be considered at all, it must be considered after we have finished and completed our deliberations on the S.R. Bill.

Secondly, Sir, this is called a Special Resolution. This Special Resolution is practically in the nature of a motion for adjournment so far as its admissibility is concerned. For a Special Resolution to be admitted, there must be special reasons and special circumstances. Sir, I submit there are no special reasons and the motion does not satisfy the conditions laid down for the admissibility of a resolution of a special nature under the Rules. Sir, I would like to know what are the special reasons the mover has urged for its being taken up so suddenly and in preference to the appointed business and without any previous notice. In the first place, Sir, this ought to have been included in the regular agenda so that members may have had enough time and opportunity to disuss this subject and study its *pros* and *cons*. The Leader of the House has taken us by surprise by suddenly bringing this subject in the form of a resolution. Sir, the idea of bi-lingual State or Dakshina Pradesh was in the air for the last two or three months. It was being disussed both on the platform and in the press and we have all expressed our opinion. So, it would have been more appropriate if the mover of the Resolution had brought this in regular agenda and given us sufficient notice. Notice of this Resolution was given to us only this morning. We were not in a position to study it in detail. We have no

time to send in amendments. Sir, the very idea of a special resolution is that the subject matter is something of recent occurrence and it must also be of public importance.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That is an adjournment motion.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I know I can make a distinction between a special resolution and an adjournment motion. A special resolution is permitted to be moved only when the mover has had no sufficient time to bring up the subject matter in the ordinary way and if it is only of recent occurrence. Now this subject has been before the public for a very long time and there is no reason why it should be admitted as a special resolution.

Sir, another thing is that under the Rules a special resolution must be such that it should relate to a matter which is the concern of the Government. I draw the attention of the House to Rule 102 (*c*). The resolution must raise a definite issue and secondly, when the opinion of this House is placed before the Government, it must be the concern of the Government, and the Government must be in a position to implement it. Whatever issue is raised through the resolution, it must be within the competence of the Government to implement it. But here, Sir, the subject matter of this Resolution is not the concern of the Government of this State and is not within their competence. It concerns the Government of India. Let me read the resolution, Sir.

> "This Assembly is of opinion that in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bilingual States with regional Council for each Linguistic area."

This will make it clear, Sir, that this House has been asked to consider a special resolution the subject matter of which affects not Mysore, but which concerns the whole of India. So, it is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the State Government. This is a matter which can more appropriately be discussed by the Parliament. After all, what is it that we are doing here? We do not know what is the view of Madras or Hyderabad and can we legislate and lay down a rule or principle for the entire country? Are we competent to do it? Beyond this, Sir, such matters can be discussed by this House only when they are referred by the President of India. Matters affecting other States, matters affecting the entire country and matters concerning the reorganisation of the different States can be considered only when they are referred to us by the President of India. This matter has not been referred by the President of India and thereby we are trying to appropriate to ourselves a power to which we are not entitled. We cannot lay down a resolution which will affect other States also and it is beyond the purview and jurisdiction of this House. Hence this House is not competent to discuss this Resolution. Firstly, it is a matter concerning the Parliament as it comes under List I. Secondly, it is not a concern of this Government or this House to deliberate on an issue of this kind.

Next Sir, the Resolution as I said must raise a specific issue; it must be definite and it must give a clear idea of what we are expected to do. This Resolution is so vague and omnibus that I am afraid that we are going to lay down rules not only for ourselves, but for posterity. Let me read the Resolution again:

> "That this Assembly is of the opinion that in the circumstances existing in India, for the rapid development of various areas and for ensuring unity and security of India, it is desirable, wherever and whenever feasible, to form bilingual States with regional Council for each Linguistic area."

It does not raise any definite issue on which we are called upon to give our opinion. 'whenever and wherever feasible'.—It may be now or it may be a hundred years hence. It may be feasible here and it may not be feasible in Madras or Uttar Pradesh. In the first place, it is not a resolution at all.

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.) What is it we are going to resolve and on whose behalf are we going to resolve and for whose benefit are we going to resolve and lay down these things? On the other hand, if the Government have courage, let them bring forward a specific proposal. We will see what it is. Let them say that such and such areas will form a bi-lingual State. Sir, I have also a feeling that this Resolution if allowed or admitted and passed, will be a direct negation of the principle we have adopted just now. This principle we have adopted just now is specific and it says that uni-lingual and uni-composite State should be formed, *i.e.*, a single State of uni-lingual or composite character should be formed. Immediately after that, the House is now asked to take a decision to consider the question of merging with other States to form one Pradesh. This position is directly inconsistent with the motion we have just adopted. This Resolution will have the effect of negativing that position. Under the Rules also, if the House takes a decision, after sufficient deliberation on a motion another resolution which negatives it cannot be moved.

Sir, on these grounds I submit that this Special Resolution should not be allowed to be moved.

Another point I want to submit is that sufficient time has not been given to us. When copies of this Special Resolution were circulated to us this morning, I was under the impression that it would be taken up three or four days later and that we would have sufficient time to consider the subject and table amendments and form our own opinions. We are now asked to give our opinion on this subject without previous notice. Strictly speaking, even if it is admitted, we must get at least three or four days time. We must dispose of all amendments concerning the S.R. Bill and afterwards we can consider this Special Resolution should the Speaker be still pleased to hold that this Resolution is in order and worthy of being discussed in the light of my objections. What is the purpose of introducing this confusion in the midst of a Bill?

On these grounds—that it is not a subject which concerns the Mysore Government, but one which concerns the Government of India and that it ought to have been referred to us by the President of India, I submit, Sir, that this Resolution is inadmissible and should not be allowed to be discussed in this House.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA—Sir, I shall answer all the points the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition has raised. Firstly he said that he did not have sufficient notice of this Resolution and in the same breath he said that this idea of combining States has been before us for the last four or five months. One of his arguments cancels the other.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—My argument is that we had no time to study.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—In fact, the speech that I made when I moved the Bill contained the ideas of the Government so far as this matter is concerned. Anyway Sir, if he pleads want of sufficient time, he has answered it himself.

This is a definite issue. I hope he will agree with that point of view. It is the concern of the Government because it is as Chief Minister I am moving this Resolution. As Leader of this House, it is not merely my business to voice my own opinion. It is my business also to voice the opinion of this House. Otherwise, there would be no meaning to the office I hold *i.e.*, the Leader of the House. Therefore, Sir, whether is technically right or wrong,—I do not know,—we have to catch the substance, as I have been often saying. If this House feels a particular resolution has to be passed in the interests of the country, that resolution ought to be placed before the House for normal consideration. I have no doubt, whatsoever, that the overwhelming majority of this House today feels that it is not only the concern of this Government but it is the concern of this House. Sir, he further said: if Government is not in a position to implement this idea, we cannot bring forward such a resolution. That argument applies to the whole Bill. We are not in a position to implement the Bill that we are now

considering. We have merely to furnish our opinion on the Bill. If it is strictly construed that whatever we are not in a position to implement we cannot discuss, then we cannot discuss the Bill at all. Therefore, Sir, this Resolution is in similar position as the Bill. If we can consider the Bill, we can also conder this Resolution.

Sir, in the Bill that has been sent to us, in the Introductory portion, page 3, para, 8, it reads as follows :—

> " In view of the proposal for the union of the two States which is now under active consideration, no provision has been made in the draft Bill in regard to territorial adjustments between the States of Bihar and West Bengal. A separate Bill will be introduced in due course to implement the decision which may be taken about these States."

Therefore, the idea of merging of two States has been definitely stated in the Bill that has been sent to us by the Government of India. It may be that it does not make a reference to Mysore or any of the South Indian States ; but the idea is there. Just as the Leader of the Opposition is at liberty to move any amendment to a motion made, this House is in a position to suggest expansion, contraction, addition or alteration of the State. Therefore, this idea of two States joining together is *intra vires* of the motion I have moved. 'Wherever' and 'whenever' are certainly used. But, 'wherever' does not mean, it is in Europe or Africa. We are considering these problems as India. If that is also literally construed, what business have we to consider at this stage, problems relating to South Canara, Districts in Bombay State, Coorg and Hyderabad State which have got separate legislatures ? We are considering here problems which are not strictly and legally within one jurisdiction, because the nature of the problem is such. We are called upon to make suggestions in the matter of reorganisation of the States in the whole of India in general, and with particular reference to us.

Then, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition says that this Resolntion negatives the decision that we have already taken. It does not. If it was so, I would be the last person to bring up any such resolution for the consideration of this House. I may categorically state for the statisfaction of my Hon'ble friend that I am one with him in doing the very best to bring into existence the new State of Mysore in a harmonious atmosphere. I want everybody in this House and in the State to feel happy when this State is brought into existence in the month of October. It is in order to fulfil the idea that has already been accepted by this House and by the Leader of the Opposition that I am moving this Resolution. There is no ulterior motive behind this. In fact, this Resolution is the fulfilment of the decision we have taken.

3 P.M.

Sir, he asked me the purpose of the Resolution. The purpose is more important and he has rightly put that question. The purpose is, in this House when the decision was taken on this question in the month of December last, the Leader of the Opposition saw substantial portion of this House remained neutral. It was after all with a bare majority of six or seven that we passed the resolution for the creation of a new State. The purpose today is that all of us should act unanimously, think unanimously and prosper unanimously, so far as the new State is concerned. It is with that high purpose I have brought this Resolution. In fact, I wanted to take the Leader of the Opposition and other prominent members of this House into confidence before I moved this Resolution and I sent them letters requesting them to attend the meeting at which we wanted to consider this Resolution. Unfortunately the letters might not have reached the Hon'ble Members in time. They therefore, see the utmost *bona fides* and consideration that I entertain for them and I have no wish whatever to take them by surprise. In the interest of good feeling and unanimity of approach to this big problem, I have tabled this

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

Resolution and I seek the co-operation and the goodwill of the Leader of the Opposition and his friends in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise for lunch and meet at 3-45.

The House rose for Lunch at Eight Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Forty-right Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ (ಹುಲಿಯೂರು ದುರ್ಗ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಆವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂಬ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳೂ ಬಹಳ ನುಲುಚವಾಗಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಅವ ಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳ ಮೇರೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸು ವುದು ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ನಿಯಮಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳು ವುದು ಅನುಕೂಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—This Resolution is admissible for the following reasons. Generally, amendments are tabled to a Bill when it comes up for discussion before this Assembly, but regarding a special resolution, in effect it will be an amendment to a Bill, a special resolution was tabled for a particular Bill—that was in 1953; when we discussed the Andhra State Bill. A special resolution was tabled and it was allowed and now also a Special Resolution has been tabled. There is no reason why it should not be admitted when we have already created a precedent in this matter. This Special Resolution concerns Mysore State and other States of India. This Bill itself covers all States and we are entitled to comment upon the provisions of this Bill, though we may not evince much interest in provisions which do not concern Mysore State and this is important in that it is going to enunciate a principle which has already been accepted under some of the provisions of this Bill and therefore it is perfectly in order that this Special Resolution should be allowed.

MR. SPEAKER.—Several points are raised by the Leader of the Opposition for not admitting this motion. Of course, the Hon'ble Members are aware that it is included in the List of Business and that List of Business was distributed to the Hon'ble Members in time yesterday according to the information available. But yesterday the Leader of the House approached me and asked for permission to suspend some of the rules, as was stated by the Leader of the House, just to have this Resolution passed in preference to the amendments so that the amendments that may be taken up may have a smooth passage. Therefore, I have suspended the procedure under rule 23 and have allowed this motion to be discussed.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I bow to the ruling of the Chair, but to facilitate a healthy discussion, I would submit that this may be taken up a little late because, as I submitted, this Special Resolution came to our hands rather late and we have had no time to consult among ourselves and come to a conclusion. Till now both the Opposition and the Treasury Bench have treated this as a non-party matter and it is true that the Leader of the House took the Opposition into confidence in various vital matters. I am anxious to see that harmonious atmosphere is maintained. So I would submit that this question may be taken up after we dispose of the Bill, one or two days later, because, as I said, we want to consult among ourselves and we have had no time to do this. I would request that we may be given one or two days' time.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—So far as his suggestion is concerned, if it is merely for the purpose of thinking over, I would readily agree to it. Let him not take too much time over it. For instance, we may

agree that the Resolution may be taken up tomorrow. He will have time almost a day and there are some amendments which we may discuss in the meanwhile, but the passing of this Resolution would create a very good atmosphere in this House and as several members have said, it would facilitate the unanimous acceptance of not only some amendments but also the Bill as a whole. No doubt he would take time, as he says, but the time may not be indefinite; it may be some time tomorrow; whatever time he suggests tomorrow, I have no objection to accept it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—One o'clock.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I agree.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narsipur).—After the question hour.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think this is agreeable to all the Hon'ble Members of this House.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—I am not a party to it. That is between the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition.

STATES REORGANISATION BILL, 1956.

Clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now amendments. There are no amendments proposed with regard to clauses in Part I. Part II, Clause 3.

Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepally-Gudibanda).—Sir, I move:

'In sub-clause (1)—

(1) after item (*d*), the following items (*e*) to (*i*) shall be added, namely—

"(*e*) Kolar District;

(*f*) parts of Devanahalli, Dodballapur, Hoskote taluks and the whole taluks of Anekal and Bangalore South of Bangalore District;

(*g*) whole of Pavagada taluk and eastern parts of Koratagere and Madhugiri taluks of Tumkur District;

(*h*) eastern parts of Molakalmuru, Challakere, Jagalur and Chitaldrug taluks of Chitaldrug District; and

(*i*) Bellary town and Moka and Rupangudi firkas of Bellary taluk of Bellary District;"

(2) in line 10, after the words 'existing State of Hyderabad', the words and comma "and Mysore, respectively" shall be inserted.'

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸ ವಿಚಾರ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆಂಧ್ರಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ನಾನು ಮಾತ ನಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸ್ಟೇಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ರೀ ಆರ್ಗನೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬು ದನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ನೋಡುವ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು, ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಾಯೊ ಳಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಒಳಗೊಂದು ಹೊರಗೊಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತ ನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ಇಂಡಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಪ್ರಾಧಾನ್ಯ ವಾಗಿ ಈ ಭಾಷಾ ಆಧಾರವೊಂದರಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿರ ತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾದರೂ ಹೇಗೆ? ಆಂಧ್ರ, ತಮಿಳುನಾಡು, ಕೇರಳ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ, ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಹೀಗೆ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಭಾಷಾಭಿಮಾನವಲ್ಲದೆ ಮತ್ತೇನಿದೆ? ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಈಗ ಮತ್ತೆ ನಮಗೆ ಆ ಕಾನರ ಗೋಡು ಬರಬೇಕು, ನೀಲಗಿರಿ ಬರಬೇಕು, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಬರಬೇಕು, ಇದು ಬರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುವಂಥ ಕಾರಣ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕನ್ನಡ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರೇ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಆ ಭಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಿ, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಇವರು ಮೈಸೂರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕಂಪೋ ಜಿಟ್ ಕ್ಯಾರಕ್ಟರಿನ ದೇಶ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನಾದರೂ ಈಗ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಭಾವನೆ ಯಿದೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ಭಾವನೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡೇ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 18-20 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನರು ತೆಲುಗು ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕವ ರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಆಂಧ್ರವನ್ನು ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಕಿಚ್ಚು ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಂಕುಚಿತ ಮನೋಭಾವವಿದೆಯೋ ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿ ರುವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಲಾಜಿಕ್ಕೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆಂಧ್ರರು ಕೋಲಾರ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ